REMARKS

This case has been reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 25 April 2002. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in the Official Action, Claims 1, 2 and 4 have now been amended to more clearly clarify the inventive concept of the Applicant.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2 and 4, however, have now been amended and it is believed that newly-amended Claims 1, 2 and 4 along with Claim 3 now satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Prior to a discussion of the Examiner's further objections and rejections made in the outstanding Official Action, it is believed that it may be beneficial to briefly review the subject Patent Application system in light of the inventive concept of the Applicant. The system of the subject Patent Application is directed to a remote-end route-calculating navigation system. The remote-end route-calculating navigation system includes an information center having an information unit, the information unit having an electronic map, route calculating software, and a first communication device capable of transmitting and receiving phonic and digital information. A navigation requester includes a satellite positioning device and a second communication device, the second

communication device having a man-to-system interface, which receives input from a user for controlling the navigation requester, an output unit, which outputs audio and video information, a data unit which serves as a memory, a hands-free unit, a voice synthesizer which has pre-set messages stored in a memory thereof, longitude/latitude contrasting and calculating equipment and a communications protocol unit.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Pu Patent #6,292,743. It is the Examiner's contention that it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art that there must be some sort of well-known communication protocol unit included in the wireless communication device of the Pu system in order to establish communication between the navigation requester and the information center.

The Pu reference is directed to a mobile navigation system. As shown in Figure 1, the navigation system 102 receives data from GPS satellites 110 for tracking purposes. The navigation system 102 has the capability for wireless communications. Navigation server 114 is coupled to the Internet 118 and the navigation server 114 is used to generate and download optimal routing information to the navigation system 102. As shown in Figure 2, the navigation system comprises a navigation computer 204, a mapping database 208, a display screen 212, a keypad input device 214, a speech interface 218, a GPS receiver 206, a wireless transceiver 202, and a telephony device

210.

The wireless transceiver 202 is used to provide standard and enhanced telephony services via the telephonic device 210. One such enhanced telephonic service is the automatic display of the current time and day relative to a called party's location upon dialing out. Voice messages are transmitted to the user purely through the telephonic system 210. Any sort of text messaging delivered to the user must be delivered via display screen 212 to display the output of navigation computer 204. Thus, if a user at the base station 106 needs to transmit a textual message to the user in the vehicle, the message must be transmitted to the navigation computer 204 and displayed on the display screen 212. The telephone device 210 is used for voice and text messaging only, with no voice synthesis capabilities. Thus, in order to receive textual messages, the user must take his eyes off the road and examine display screen 212. This is, of course, quite dangerous when a user is driving in traffic.

Although the Pu reference includes a speech interface 218, the speech interface is a voice recognition unit, and not a voice synthesizer.

The system of the subject Patent Application, however, includes a voice synthesizer unit which has a plurality of stored messages saved in a voice synthesizer memory. Thus, a user at the base station can transmit textual messages to the user in the vehicle, and the user in the vehicle will be able to receive the messages, via the voice

synthesizer, without having to take his eyes off of the road. Additionally, the system of the subject Patent Application includes a voice synthesizer memory with stored pre-set messages. Thus, bandwidth is saved as the amount of data needed for transmitting routing information is greatly decreased, since the full messages are already stored in memory on the vehicle.

Additionally, as shown in Figure 5 of the Pu reference, in order to save bandwidth, the Pu system uses a natural language description 502 consisting of start and end route designations 504. The system transmits a minimal amount of information in the form of the natural language transmission and relies upon the various memory devices stored within the vehicle. Under normal driving conditions, this may suffice, however, under extreme driving conditions or in an emergency, additional information will be required which is not available in the on-vehicle memory.

Although the system of the subject Patent Application utilizes on-vehicle memory, it also includes a variety of receivers and output systems, capable of receiving and transmitting to the user text, graphical, and audio messages and information. Thus, the base station may send any type of information which is needed by the user.

Thus, the Pu reference does not provide for: "...said voice synthesizer having stored messages saved in a voice synthesizer memory...", as is clearly provided in newly-amended Independent Claim 1.

Thus, based upon the newly-amended Independent Claim 1, it is not believed that the subject Application is made obvious by, or is anticipated by, the Pu reference when Independent Claim 1 is carefully reviewed.

It is now believed that the remaining Claims 2-4 show patentable distinction over the prior art cited by the Examiner for at least the same reasons as those previously discussed for Independent Claim 1.

The remaining references cited by the Examiner, but not used in the rejection, have been reviewed, but are believed to be further removed when patentable distinctions are taken into account than those cited by the Examiner in the rejection.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration #26,049

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
3458 Ellicott Center Drive-Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678